

THE POLYNESIAN.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1853.

A New Hand at the Bellows.

The Editor of the Argus, in his paper of the 16th of February, made use of the following language when speaking of the Small Pox, just then brought near by the Charles Mallory.

Rum and venereal have done their worst to annihilate this people and have failed, but if the small pox were to be introduced it would settle all our political difficulties in a short time. If the government cannot prevent the introduction of the disease, we hope they will at least adopt the most stringent measures in their power to contract its ravages by affording every facility to the people of being vaccinated.

Since writing the above we understand that the government have appointed a committee to consider the best mode of effecting a prompt and universal vaccination of the native population; their report has not yet been made known. If it be proposed to send medical men into the different districts in order to vaccinate the people, and pay those gentlemen for their services, we think the experiment would be too expensive. On the other hand, if the government were to send fresh vaccine matter to the missionaries officiating in the different districts, and enjoin upon the people by Royal Proclamation the necessity and opportunity of being vaccinated, then the thing would be cheaper and more effectually carried out. We cannot for a moment imagine that the missionaries would excuse themselves on the plea of other or more pressing occupations. They have professedly come here to save this people physically as well as morally, and in a case of emergency of this kind they ought to be held to their professions.

Now, as the government adopted, to the letter, the mode of vaccination recommended by the editor, as the one that would accomplish the work both cheaper and more effectually, we should like to know the influences that have compelled him to shew his own words, to change his opinion and render himself so ridiculous as he has by the following, published in his paper of the 25th of August.

We are perfectly willing that they would have full credit for having done all they knew, if they can so make it appear, to prevent the spreading and mitigate the virulence of the disease; but the "Lover of Justice" does not yet make this apparent. He mentions the meetings of the Medical faculty, held on the 10th, 11th and 12th of February, and says, that "in examining the records of the proceedings of these meetings, he can find no allusion to any proposition to organize the vaccination by dividing the country into districts and paying the physicians 10 cents per head. He further says that Dr. Judd remembers that the subject was spoken of with a price of 10 or 12 cents, but did not understand that any distinct proposition was made. In explaining this affair so fully, it is a little singular as great a "Lover of Justice" should have omitted so small a tribute to truth as not to mention the subsequent meeting (on the 14th if we remember correctly,) at which were present Drs. Hardy, Chairman; Newcomb, Secretary; Lathrop, Hillebrand, Hoffmann, Ford and Mr. Judd, when the proposition was a *not* "spoken of," but discussed and embodied in a resolution which was passed by the Gentlemen present, and of which Mr. Judd took note, if not a copy.

This we conceive that the plea of ignorance set up by the "Lover of Justice" in the defence of the Ministers is untenable. Mr. Judd at least, was perfectly conversant with the proposition and knew it reduced to a tangible form to be acted upon. That Mr. Judd should have *misconceived* the benefit or practicability of the measure may be an error of judgment, but it is deeply to be regretted that an incompetency, capable of such fatal errors of judgment, should for so many years have been the ruling genius of the Administration.

Who "misconceived the benefit or practicability of the measure" with more distinctness than the editor of the Argus, when he wrote in February, "we think the experiment would be too expensive?" Or who has exhibited greater "incompetency" than he, when he recommended "the government to send fresh vaccine matter to the missionaries officiating in the different districts?" The very thing that was done.

Either the editor is exceedingly oblivious of what his own views once were, when he thus contradicts himself, and abuses men for doing just what he recommended, or he has had a new hand at the bellows, who blows hot, when he should have blown cold, under the shield of editorial partiality.

Another equally barefaced contradiction occurs in the same numbers of the Argus from which we have already quoted.

In February, the editor said, and truly, that "rum and venereal have done their worst to annihilate this people, and have failed, but if the small pox were to be introduced, it would settle all our political difficulties in a short time." How? by depopulating the islands and leaving them without a government, or the means of supporting one? That, certainly is the inference. But how radically have his opinions changed since February! In his number of Aug. 25th he has entirely forgotten that it was "rum, venereal and small pox" that were producing results so frightful to contemplate. And although these causes—at least the two former—have been at work with unyielding certainty for more than half a century, and the measles, whooping-cough and small pox have more recently come in as auxiliaries in the fearful work of destruction, yet the editor of the Argus, forgetful of his former assertion, now says, "Is it well when a country is becoming depopulated and waste, when its resources are drying up, its revenues diminishing, when commerce and industry are languishing, and agriculture being strangled, when men look to annexation, not in itself preferable to independence, but as a relief; and all this through the ignorance and incapacity of Ministers to appreciate the position of the country, the spirit of the times, the important events transpiring around, and their bearing and reaction upon it?"

In February, it was a series of *natural* causes by which the "country was becoming depopulated and waste," and the other evils were following, as a matter of course; and inevitable; but now, in August, it is "all through the ignorance and incapacity of ministers." Shame!

Does the editor suppose the public have lost their reason or their common sense, when he makes such charges? The rapid depopulation of two islands is a clear and palpable fact. The inevitable results just as are sure to follow. Without a people the nation is becoming enfeebled; without a people to buy goods, commerce will languish; without people, agriculture cannot be prosecuted; without a people a revenue cannot be raised. The point to be ascertained is, what is the occasion of the diminution of the people; for all hinges upon that. And this question the editor truthfully answered in February, as quoted above, but has falsely attributed to the "incapacity of Ministers" in August, as an impartial and unbiased writer will ultimately judge.

As it has been received since our last issue, The ship Benjamin Howard is hourly expected from San Francisco, with the most of July 20th, and

As Mr. Montgomery has turned us over to the "tender mercies" of the consistent editor of the Argus, we might be excused from further comments upon the topic on which we unfortunately disagreed, but we will add a few words of explanation.

In the first place, he has misquoted one portion of our remarks, and misconceived another. In our original comments upon the subject of legislation on morals, we asserted what we believed to be the opinions of some people in almost every country, in regard to laws upon morals,—meaning on those points, particularly, to which Mr. M. acknowledges himself opposed. We further said the advocates of these doctrines would "sweep away the Penal Code,"—meaning on these points of course, and we did not say, as he quotes us, "sweep away the entire Penal Code." We then went on to express our belief that the adoption of such a doctrine would transform the most orderly community into a Pandemonium, and as a reason for this belief, cited two well known periods in Hawaiian history, when these laws were relaxed, and those results followed; and not only the practice of those special vices prevailed to an alarming and disgusting extent, but thefts and other crimes increased; in short, society was fast retrograding to a state of anarchy.

This was the substance of our remarks, and our object was, to point out what we apprehend would prove a most dangerous experiment among a people like this, and not to "calumniate our neighbors," which we had no wish to do.

We accept Mr. M.'s disclaimer of "personal discourtesy." As we write our own editorials, and are alone responsible for them, we refer him to the following expressions in his letter in the Polynesian, as the "personal discourtesies" which would have justified us in returning his manuscript.

"Yourself as the stipendiary advocate of the powers that be."

"Whatever other consequences may result from their proceedings, I presume the addition of such a sum periodically to a somewhat hungry exchequer, cannot be otherwise than gratifying to the head of that department and of course, to his organ."

We presume Mr. M. will not admit that he must defend a client in a *terrore* or *dishonorable* action because he is his "stipendiary;" but would spurn the imputation, as we most certainly do when charged upon us. The article attacked was neither written by a clerical, medical or legal portion of the community, nor were any cases consulted by the editor when he wrote it.

We are gratified at Mr. M.'s "exalted opinion" of us, and shall endeavor not to forfeit it by "calumniating our neighbors." But the laws of which he complains, we regard as of too vital importance to the good of society here,—however little need there may be of them in other enlightened countries,—to be unwisely abrogated. The result, we honestly believe, would be most disastrous to the community; would lead to an open and disgusting exhibition of vice, and concurrent evils of immense magnitude.

Anti Cant accuses us of wholesale slander in stating that the vaccination by physicians had proved equally ineffectual with that of other persons. We assure the writer that we had no idea of wounding his professional dignity, or of impeaching his medical skill, by such an assertion. We stated what was the common understanding of the community at the time, and what still continues to lack the proof to disprove. If we have been in error in our opinion, we shall be most happy to make the *amende* when the proof is produced. At present, the only facts bearing on the case go to prove the assertion. We know of three cases who have died within a few days, all of whom were vaccinated by physicians. We have heard of a multitude of others, among which was the son of Kekaulaah, mentioned by our correspondent last week.

We also have the testimony of Mr. Parke, whose veracity we presume Anti Cant will not impeach. He stated that of 311 persons vaccinated by the different physicians in town, 140 had been cured. Of 166 cases vaccinated by other persons not physicians, 69 had recovered. "From this data, Mr. Parke gave it as his opinion that no difference could be made between those vaccinated by physicians and those vaccinated by others as to the safety of vaccination."

Drs. Hoffmann, Hardy, Wood and Ford also stated in regard to vaccination, that they had "found in their practice here, very many who were not protected by vaccination. They were asked, if it was owing to the person who vaccinated. They all testified that it was not. They had found persons vaccinated by all the different physicians not protected. Dr. Wood stated that in the U. S. vaccination was not considered as the exclusive work of physicians. It was often performed by others. No great skill was required."

Now with all this testimony, and not a particle to the contrary, how "Anti Cant" can have the "barefaced impudence" to accuse us of slandering the medical profession by stating "that their vaccinations were as great failures as those of the Minister and his Deputies," can only be accounted for by the fact, that religion should never be tainted by a forcible and unnatural connection with the petty movements of political squabbles. We do not admit the doctrine, but own its application by "Anti Cant."

We say again, we have never, for a moment, had the first shadow of a desire to subtract an iota from the well earned commendation frequently expressed for the Honolulu medical profession, in their labors and practice during the prevalence of the small pox. But we must claim the right to defend ourselves from a wicked charge, unsupported by truth, and contradicted by the very persons said to have been slandered.

Small Pox at Lahaina.

Mr. Editor—I have heard it rumored that the small pox is steadily increasing at Lahaina, and that there are now nearly as many cases there, as at Honolulu. By Honolulu I do not mean the whole island of Oahu, but the city proper. Can you inform your readers whether this report be true or not?

We have heard the same rumor during the past week, but have no correct information on the subject, from which to furnish an answer to our correspondent. We would suggest, as a proper means of preventing false reports, that the Health Commissioners of Lahaina furnish us a weekly report, giving the whole number and also the number of new cases weekly, by which the facts will fully appear. Otherwise, rumors worse than the truth, will very likely gain credence in the community.

That there is but little small pox now prevailing in Honolulu, we think the reports justify us in asserting, and it is rapidly diminishing in the city and immediate precincts. In other places on Oahu it is still prevailing, with fatal effects. From Maui and Hawaii, we have no recent reports. From Kure, we learn that it is not prevailing to any extent, and but very few cases now exist on that island. But from every quarter, except Oahu, the

want of authentic reports leaves us without data from which to judge of the present state of the disease generally.

News from the Whaling Fleet.

The schooner CHANCE, on her passage from Kauai, spoke the whale-ship Sheffield, Capt. Royce, who has furnished us the following report from the whaling fleet. It will be noticed that the ships spoken in June and July, had done remarkably well up to that time, and if the same success should attend them through the season, a large catch will reward their arduous enterprise.

The Sheffield is from the Ochootsk, July 24th, and had taken 610 casks oil, 30,000 lbs. bone.

She spoke, July 24th, Huntsville, Smith, 10 whales; Arnold, Harding, 6 whales; Columbia, Cash, 7 whales; Vermon, Little, 7 whales. Heard from in June, ship Sea, Sowle, 4 whales; Northern Light, Stott, 10 whales; Charles, Brown, 1 whale; Gladiator, Turner, 2 whales; Spoke, July 19th, Empire, Henry, 10 whales; Daniel Wood, Tallman, 1 whale. 22d, Pacific, Allen, 16 whales. 24th, Bark Susan, Seabury, 5 whales.

The ship Susan, Smith, of Nantucket, was lost among the ice, date not given. The crew was saved, with the exception of two, by the Black Warrior, and distributed among the fleet.

Ships, Shipping, &c.

The bark Rebekah, Speight, arrived at San Francisco on the 15th ult. in 21 days from Koloa, Kauai, with a cargo of Hogs and 15 Passengers.

—Brigantine WILHELMINE arrived at this port on the 31st inst. from Hanalei, Kauai, with a cargo of wood &c., to J. Dudoit.

—The bark SOHMAH, Hall, arrived on the 5th inst. in 140 days from Boston, with a full freight for this port. She is discharging at the Market wharf.

The brig Boston, Capt. Tapley, sails this afternoon for San Francisco with a full cargo of Sugar, Syrup, and Oil, and takes the Mail for the U. S. The fine appearance of the Boston, as she now lies in our harbor ready for sea, has been remarked by many, and certainly reflects credit on her commander. We wish her a speedy voyage over.

—The whale-ship Sheffield, Royce, of Cold Sp'g, arrived on the 9th from the Ochootsk, having left the ground on the 24th of July. She has been 36 mos. on this voyage, and has taken 7000 barrels of oil and 115,000 lbs. bone. She has now 3,000 barrels on board, and 50,000 lbs. bone; having shipped and sold the balance of her catch at Sydney and Hong Kong. She has taken 1,600 barrels this season, and left the ground early, because she had no more casks to fill.

The Sheffield reports ships doing as well as they did last year, up to the time of her leaving. She is bound home, and will sail in a few days.

Mechanic's Benevolent Society.

In accordance with a public notice, previously given, a large meeting of mechanics was held at the Court House on Wednesday evening last, and preliminary measures adopted to organize a Society, by the appointment of a committee to draft rules, &c., with power to call another meeting at some future day.

The mail for San Francisco by the brig "Boston" will close at the Post-office this day, Saturday at 2 P. M. No mail will probably leave here for two or three weeks, as no vessel is now in port bound for that port.

It will be seen by the health report that the number of cases of small pox in this city is but 13.

For the Polynesian.

Honolulu, Sept. 3, 1853.

Mr. Editor.—In the joint address of the Consuls of Great Britain and France, as published in your paper of this morning, I noticed the following: "We are fully informed of the extraordinary course adopted by some American merchants, landed proprietors and other citizens of the United States connected with the Protestant missionaries, residing on Oahu, with a view to induce Your Majesty to alienate Your Sovereignty and the independence of the Islands here, in an indirect negotiation for annexation to the United States."

This language implies all, and hence conveys an erroneous impression. It appears to me that it would have been both proper and just for the Honorable Consuls to have inquired into the facts before preferring what they have regarded as a grave charge in an official manner. If they had done this, their sense of justice would have been vindicated, and I wish to state distinctly, and hope I may be understood, that no missionary is any more responsible for what I think, say, or do, than he is for the course of any other man, or than the Honorable representatives are for the private conduct of any British or French subject.

To illustrate, I heard a prominent British subject say, months since, "that he should go for annexation, as it would increase the value of his property 100 per cent." Now any one can see that it would be unjust to tax this one by the British subjects residing in Honolulu, and especially Her B. M.'s Consul General, as his or her sentiments, and upon it to found a charge against them. In stating the above I violate no confidence, as the remark was made in the presence of several gentlemen without reservation, and not addressed to me. It was not supposed to imply any want of loyalty to His Sovereign, but an expression of what his personal interest dictated, without detriment to those of H. B. M.

Others, whether missionaries or not, are not responsible for my opinions, nor am I for theirs; nor is one missionary responsible for the opinions of another. The points of contention between missionaries, very many other protestant Christians and numerous, especially upon religious subjects, but each man is responsible for himself.

I am led to these remarks by a sense of justice to the missionaries who are unjustly implicated in the charge. As for whatever I have done, they are not responsible. They were, and probably most of them still ignorant of what I said, and I know not whether it would meet their approbation or not. I acted for myself and not for others.

I subscribed a pacific and friendly memorial to His Majesty upon the subject mentioned. My partner, Mr. Cooke, and Mr. Rice, the secular superintendent at Punahou, subscribed it on my invitation. Neither of us are or ever were clergymen. To no other person, however, had I been connected with the mission, and I may have been mistaken in the views which led to this measure, but I claim that in doing it I was actuated by a sincere desire for the welfare of the natives.

I mean no disrespect to the Honorable Representatives by this communication; but simple justice to those embraced in their address, but in no ways implicated, demands that the correction should be as public as the charge has been, and I think proper to speak upon the subject of joint representation, to guard against future errors from other parties.

Perhaps I should say before closing, that the relation which Mr. Cooke and myself formerly sustained to the mission was dissolved something more than two years since; but our sympathies are, and I trust always will be, with the missionary cause, as they were, and before we parted, we agreed that we were the sympathies of millions of our countrymen and British and other European Christians, at the present moment.

Mr. Editor.—I agree with you that the story you quote from the San Francisco Herald, that a brig was once fitted out from Oregon expressly to bring the small pox to these islands, is incredible. Men rarely do anything so wicked with deliberate purpose and at their own cost, without any thing to gain by it. An Italian assassin can be hired to stab a man in the back for five dollars, but he will not do it without pay. Most pestilential diseases are not spread by design, because all dread them, and nobody gains anything unless it be the doctor, who is himself put to mortal peril. But there is one disease which puts money into men's pockets, and which is very contagious that we cease to regard it with horror, and yet one more destructive than small pox or the cholera; a disease which palsies the physical energies, maddens the brain, and brings with it poverty, crime and death. Those who survive the first attack, as almost every one does, for its approaches are very insidious, have not passed the ordeal as in the case of the small pox, and are then a third and fourth, like the mariner on the outer margin of the whirlpool, who sails around slowly and unconsciously, but moves swifter with every circuit until he plunges into the vortex of death.

It is an indisputable fact that the virus of this destructive disease is deliberately brought here every year in ships and briggs and schooners, and money is made by the operation, for strange as it may seem, it is actually purchased by the victims, who inoculate themselves with it daily, and yet suppose they are taking it in the "natural way." They are however doing great violence to nature. Thus far, for several years past the ravages of this disease have been kept from spreading extensively among the natives by severe sanitary regulations, but there are persons who are laboring to break these down and even to kindle up, all over the islands, the fires under the witches' cauldron for the concoction of this terrible poison. And they call this good "economy and a liberal policy." Such are the evils disguised by "a community of good names."

Is any one at a loss to know what the mortal disease is? Does any one dispute its malignity? Then what should be done about it? That is the question presented by one who has taken

THE ONLY REMEDY.

For the Polynesian.

Mr. Editor.—Permit me through your columns to inquire of Anti Cant, (alias Dr. Newcomb,) the meaning of the following paragraph in a late No. of the Argus.

"The attempt which has been made to connect a political movement with religious duties, and by appeals to the religious principle to stifle fair investigation, is a stab at our glorious religion itself, which should never be tainted by a forcible and unnatural connection with the petty movements of political squabbles."

Does this mean that, in our political movements, we must lay aside our religion,—that our religious principles or professions must have nothing to do with our political conduct?

A religion which could be put on and laid aside in this way, would, no doubt, be wonderfully convenient, but it would not pass very current with the great searcher of hearts. His injunction is, "whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And he has said, "we all know them by their fruits." I have always understood that the word "fruits" here includes the whole of a man's conduct not that he may act out the fend in one department of human conduct and the saint in another, and still be a very good religious man. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." True religion can never be disguised by being brought to bear upon all parts of human conduct. The opposite course is what "stabs our glorious religion."

AN INQUIRY.

For the Polynesian.

Mr. Editor.—The communication from the representatives of Great Britain and France in your last paper will probably convey a wrong impression to many of our readers. It is not true that the Protestant missionaries at these Islands have never engaged in any scheme of annexation. It has been their cherished wish, that the government may remain independent under the present constitution and rulers. Whatever may have been done by merchants, planters, or others, the protestant clergymen at the Islands have neither advised nor signed any memorial to the King touching annexation.

E. W. CLARK.
P. J. GELICK.

By Authority.

It has pleased the King to appoint His Royal Highness, General of Division, Prince Lot Kamehameha to the high office of Kuhina Nui.

And to commission the following Ministers, viz:—
JOHN YOUNG, Minister of the Interior.
R. C. WYLLIE, Minister of Foreign Relations.
ELISHA H. ALLEN, Minister of Finance.
RICHARD ARMSTRONG, Minister of Public Instruction.

Palace, September 6, 1853.

It has pleased His Majesty to appoint His Royal Highness, Prince Liholiho a member of the Board of Royal Commissioners of Public Health in place of G. P. Judd, Resigned.

Department of Foreign Relations.

Honolulu, September 3, 1853.

Sir:—It was resolved by the King in Council on the 1st of this month, that I should pass to you, officially, the Polynesian No. 17 of this day, containing the joint-Address of His Majesty to the Representatives of Great Britain and France. This I have the honor now to do, and at the same time, to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch No. 46 of the 29th August.

I have the assurance of uniform past experience that you and the United States Consuls under you have ever taken a deep and active interest in the independent Sovereignty of the King, acting fully and faithfully up to the principles declared by Mr. Clayton, on the 5th July 1853, to Wm. C. Rives, Esq., to be submitted to the Government of France and to those declared by the late Mr. Webster to yourself, under date of the 14th July 1851, of which copies were frankly and honorably sent by him, both to the British and French Governments.

With the highest respect and consideration, I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obdt. humble servt.,
R. C. WYLLIE.

To LUTHER SEVERANCE, Esq.,
U. S. Commissioner, &c., &c., &c.

U. S. Commission,

Honolulu, Sept. 3, 1853.

Sir:—I have the honor of receiving your communication of this morning, in which you say it was resolved by the King in Council on the first day of the month, that you should pass to me, officially, a copy of the joint-Address to His Majesty by the Representatives of Great Britain and France, made on that day, which you have done by enclosing a copy No. 17 of the Polynesian, published this morning.

My thanks are due to the King and Council for taking immediate measures to apprise me officially of the exact contents of the address, which I perceive remonstrates against the "extraordinary course adopted by some American merchants, landed proprietors and other citizens of the United States" to induce the King to alienate His Sovereignty and the independence of the Islands by immediate negotiation for annexation to the United States.

You are aware that the government of the United States has never made any propositions to His Majesty's government to annex the islands, though the matter has undoubtedly engaged the attention of both of our Governments, and of our subjects of the King. To me it is not surprising that the "merchants and landed proprietors," whether Americans or others, should perceive great commercial advantages in such a connection, considering that the principal part of the commerce of the islands is with the United States, and that the islands must look almost exclusively to the Pacific coast of the United States for a market for their products and the means of paying for their heavy imports. I perceive, therefore, nothing very ex-

traordinary in the project remonstrated against. And if now or at any future time it shall be found to be decidedly for the interest of both countries to unite their sovereignties, I am unable to perceive any treaty or moral obligations on the part of either to forbid the desired union, or any good reason for foreign interference to prevent it. French and English subjects might still be entitled to the privileges of the "most favored nation," and on the score of commercial advantages cannot well complain of being subjected to these islands and to the revenue laws of a country which consumes and pays for French manufactures and other products to the amount of forty millions of dollars annually, and of British goods to the amount of one hundred millions annually—the revenue laws of a country rapidly growing, and whose trade is now of more value to Great Britain and France than that of any of their colonies, if not indeed of all of them added together, vast as the English colonies are.

In view of these great interests which would be sacrificed by a disturbance of pacific relations, (to say nothing of several hundred millions of American stocks held in Europe, whose value might for the time be seriously affected,) it is not to be supposed that France will insist on the little advantage of importing into these islands silks, wines, &c., to the amount of a few thousand dollars at five per cent duty, as she now does by her construction of the treaty of 26th March 1846, a treaty which instead of being a valid reason why the King should not transfer his sovereignty, is a standing and powerful argument to justify him in doing so, since that treaty denies to him one of the most important attributes of sovereignty—one in the highest degree essential to all independent states.

Still less is it to be supposed that Great Britain will claim the privilege of the "most favored nation" under this French treaty, since she has generously thrown up her own treaty of the same date and tenure, and substituted that of 10th July 1851, in accordance with the American treaty of Washington of 20th Dec. 1849.

The right to cede or acquire territory, or to unite two independent nations by compact, is regarded as inherent in all independent sovereignties. It has certainly been practised from time immemorial. The power which can cede a part can cede all the parts. Modern history abounds in examples, and none more than English and French history. Annexation is neither a new thing, nor rare in our day, as the Turks and Arabs of Algeria, the Caffres of South Africa, and more than one hundred and thirty millions of people in India can testify,—people it is hoped who are not benefited by the change, but whether so or not, I cannot admit that annexation by voluntary consent is any more illegal or reprehensible than annexation by conquest. But whether it be done by one process or the other, the government of the United States can have no colonies. Whatever territory is added is but an integral part of the whole, and subject to the same national constitution and laws.

The expediency of union with the United States I do not propose to consider at present, for I have no authority to say that the United States will consent to any terms that may be offered; yet I have no doubt if they shall be offered they will be frankly received and duly considered; but no sinister means of accomplishing the object, however desirable, will receive any favor from the U. S. State.

I am most happy to have your testimony that the Commissioners and Consuls of the U. S. have acted fully and faithfully up to the principles declared by Mr. Clayton and Mr. Webster in the communications referred to by you, and I am not permitted to doubt that you will have as little reason hereafter, as you have now, to distrust the friendly intentions of the government and people of the United States.

My regard for the King and his government, and for the highly respectable representatives of England and France in these islands who have deemed it their duty to interpose an official remonstrance, alike demand the utmost frankness in the expression of the sentiments I entertain, which I am sure they will duly appreciate.

The agreement, or joint declaration of the 28th November, 1843, that neither Great Britain nor France would take possession of these islands as a protectorate or otherwise, was creditable to those powers. The government of the United States was not a party to the engagement; neither was Kamehameha III, so far as appears. The parties to it, by their naval forces, had both made hostile demonstrations upon the King's sovereignty. The United States had not, but both before and since, though their interests were far greater here than those of any, or all other foreign powers, they have constantly respected the government of the King. They have never sought to limit the right of his government to frame its own system of finance, enact its own revenue laws, regulate its own system of public education, establish its own judicial policy, or demanded any special favors, and they were the first to recognize the complete and unqualified national independence of the Kingdom, by the treaty of 20th Dec. 1849.

That treaty having been faithfully observed, there is nothing in the policy of the United States towards these islands which requires concealment, or demands explanation,—nothing to disturb the harmony which happily exists between the United States and the great commercial powers of Europe.

Let silence on my part, after the publication of the joint remonstrance, should make no disguise of impression here or elsewhere, and considering the distance from the seats of government of Europe and America, it may be advisable to depart from the usual course in such matters, and publish this letter also, to go with the remonstrance of the British and French Representatives.

I have the honor to be,
With great respect,
Your obedient servant,
LUTHER SEVERANCE.

His Excellency,
ROBERT CRICHTON WYLLIE,
Minister of Foreign Relations, &c., &c.

Palace, Privy Council Chamber,

September 6th, 1853.

Sir:—I am commanded by the King and Privy Council to state in reply to your despatch No. 47 of the 3d inst., that it will be published in the Polynesian of Saturday, and that all your statements made in the name of the United States, as their Representative, will be considered with the like care as those made by the Representatives of Great Britain and France.

With the highest respect and consideration, I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obdt. humble servt.,
R. C. WYLLIE.

To LUTHER SEVERANCE, Esq.,
U. S. Commissioner, &c., &c., &c.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Weekly Report.—The number of new cases of Small Pox which have been reported during the past week for the island of Oahu are 214; the number of deaths reported in the same time are 68.

From the other islands the new cases reported are 4; deaths, 2.

Total number of cases reported 5649; total deaths, 1865.

Number of cases remaining in Honolulu this day, are 13.

Honolulu, Sept. 6th, 1853.

WHITE & COYD SATINS, Long Pongees, Scarlet Bandas, Chow Chow cloth, Pongee hdkfs., Parrot Satins, gold and crimson, wh. enbr'd Cape Shawls, 7-4. For sale by
Sept. 7, 1853-4-18

RICE & CO.

FOR SALE BY G. RHODES & CO., Hanalei, Kauai, will be sold to day towards the close of October, 30,000 Ounces, of the finest quality of Gold, to be sold to G. C. MONSARRAT.

Aug. 20, 1853-36-10

NOTICE.

The co-partnership heretofore existing under the firm of F. W. Thompson & Co. expires this day by the decease of F. W